

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

BECKLEY DIVISION

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| ROBERT C. PROKOP, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| v. |) | Civil Action No. 5:15-05566 |
| |) | |
| REGIONAL JAIL AUTHORITY, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |

PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION

On May 4, 2015, Plaintiff, acting *pro se*, filed his letter-form Complaint in this matter claiming entitlement to relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.¹ (Document No. 1.) Plaintiff names the Regional Jail Authority as the defendant. (*Id.*) Plaintiff alleges that on May 20, 2014, Defendant allowed the Special Response Team [“SRT”] to conduct “training exercises using live ammo on inmates at the Southern Regional Jail.” (*Id.*, p. 1.) Plaintiff claims that “he and his cell mate had been locked down for over 24 hours when the SRT members stormed their cell and shot Plaintiff without just cause.” (*Id.*) Plaintiff complains that the jail “suspended visits for several days in an attempt to keep the injuries of many inmates suppressed.” (*Id.*, p. 2.) As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff alleges that he suffered permanent scarring to his right leg, “muscle tissue damage,” and mental trauma. (*Id.*) As relief, Plaintiff requests monetary damages. (*Id.*) Plaintiff filed his Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Cost on May 19, 2015. (Document No. 4.)

STANDARD

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the Court is required to screen each case in which a prisoner

¹ Because Plaintiff is acting *pro se*, the documents which he has filed in this case are held to a less stringent standard than if they were prepared by a lawyer and therefore, they are construed liberally. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21, 92 S.Ct. 594, 30 L.Ed.2d 652 (1972).

seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. On screening, the Court must recommend dismissal of the case if the complaint is frivolous, malicious or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. A “frivolous” complaint is one which is based upon an indisputably meritless legal theory. Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 112 S.Ct. 1728, 118 L.Ed.2d 340 (1992). A “frivolous” claim lacks “an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325, 109 S.Ct. 1827, 1831 - 32, 104 L.Ed.2d 338 (1989). A claim lacks an arguable basis in law when it is “based on an indisputably meritless legal theory.” Id., 490 U.S. at 327, 109 S.Ct. at 1833. A claim lacks an arguable basis in fact when it describes “fantastic or delusional scenarios.” Id., 490 U.S. at 327 - 328, 109 S.Ct. at 1833. A complaint therefore fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted factually when it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief. With these standards in mind, the Court will assess Plaintiff’s allegations in view of applicable law.

DISCUSSION

“[F]ederal courts must take cognizance of the valid constitutional claims of prison inmates.” Turner v. Safley, 482 U.S. 78, 84, 107 S.Ct. 2254, 2259, 96 L.Ed.2d 64 (1987). Title 42 U.S.C. § 1983 provides a remedy for violations of all “rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws [of the United States].” Thus, Section 1983 provides a “broad remedy for violations of federally protected civil rights.” Monell v. Dep’t of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658, 685, 98 S.Ct. 2018, 56 L.Ed.2d 611 (1978). Generally speaking, to state and prevail upon a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a Plaintiff must prove that (1) a person acting under color of State law (2) committed an act which deprived him of an alleged right, privilege or immunity protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

Plaintiff names the Regional Jail Authority as Defendant. Section 1983 claims, however, must be directed at a “person.” See Preval v. Reno, 203 F.3d 821 (4th Cir. 2000)(unpublished)(finding that the Piedmont Regional Jail is not a “person” under Section 1983); Roach v. Burch, 825 F.Supp. 116, 117 (N.D.W.Va. 1993)(stating that the West Virginia Regional Jail Authority is not a “person” under Section 1983); also see Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police, 491 U.S. 58, 66, 109 S.Ct. 2304, 2309, 105 L.Ed.2d 45 (1989)(Suits against a state or state agencies for monetary damages are barred by the Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution); Webb v. Parsons, 2011 WL 2076419 (S.D.W.Va. May 6, 2011)(finding that the West Virginia Regional Jail Authority, an agency of the State of West Virginia, is immune from suit under the Eleventh Amendment). Accordingly, the undersigned finds that Plaintiff has not stated a claim for which relief may be granted as to the Regional Jail Authority. The undersigned, therefore, recommends that Plaintiff’s claim against the Regional Jail Authority be dismissed.

PROPOSAL AND RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing, it is therefore respectfully **PROPOSED** that the District Court confirm and accept the foregoing factual findings and legal conclusions and **RECOMMENDED** that the District Court **DENY** Plaintiff’s Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees (Document No. 4.), **DISMISS** Plaintiff’s Complaints (Document Nos. 1 and 6.) and remove this matter from the Court’s docket.


The Plaintiff is hereby notified that this “Proposed Findings and Recommendation” is hereby **FILED**, and a copy will be submitted to the Honorable United States District Judge Irene C. Berger. Pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 636(b)(1)(B), and Rule 6(d) and 72(b), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Plaintiff shall have seventeen (17) days (fourteen days,

filing of objections and three days, mailing/service) from the date of filing of this Findings and Recommendation within which to file with the Clerk of this Court specific written objections identifying the portions of the Findings and Recommendation to which objection is made and the basis of such objection. Extension of this time period may be granted for good cause.

Failure to file written objections as set forth above shall constitute a waiver of *de novo* review by the District Court and a waiver of appellate review by the Circuit Court of Appeals. Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 155 (1985); Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 846 (4th Cir. 1985); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). Copies of such objections shall be served on opposing parties, Judge Berger and this Magistrate Judge.

The Clerk is requested to send a copy of this Proposed Findings and Recommendation to Plaintiff, who is acting *pro se*, and transmit a copy to counsel of record.

Date: June 15, 2015.



R. Clarke VanDervort
United States Magistrate Judge